

JUL 19 1921

GENERAL LIBRARY
JUL 2 1921
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIV, No. 26

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1921

WHOLE No. 395

THE DESCENT INTO AVERNUS

AENEID LIBER VI

The Atlanta Girls' High School has been unable to fill the dates requested for showings of this picture. It has been booked for all available dates to the end of the spring term, the showings extending from New Hampshire to Texas.

The greatest value of the picture in Schools as a stimulus to interest in Classics will be realized by showing it as soon as possible after the opening of the fall term. In order that the picture may be so routed as to accommodate the greatest number of schools, it is desirable that applications for showings next fall be placed as early as possible—preferably during the spring or the summer.

The beauty and educational value of the picture make it an exceedingly attractive feature for Summer Schools and Chautauqs. It has been shown to several teachers' meetings with most gratifying results.

Early application for summer dates should be made to Chauncey Smith, 78 S. Pryor St., Atlantic, Ga.

College Entrance for 1923-1925

requires Ovid. The selections listed are available in

**ALLEN AND GREENOUGH'S
Selections from Ovid**

Besides the "Metamorphoses" (167 pages), about thirty pages are given to short selections from the "Fasti", the "Amores", the "Heroides", and the "Tristia."

The Notes treat literary values as well as grammatical difficulties.

Ginn and Company
70 Fifth Avenue New York

PLACE'S BEGINNING LATIN

Besides giving a solid foundation in Latin, this book accomplishes these results:

1. Justifies the time devoted to Latin study.
2. Emphasizes the relation of Latin to English.
3. Develops a better knowledge of English.
4. Shows Roman life as compared with the life of today.
5. Provides a background that will give a new meaning and vitality to Latin study.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XIV

NEW YORK, MAY 16, 1921

No. 26

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

Fifteenth Annual Meeting

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States was held at Hunter College, New York City, April 22-23. The programme was as follows:

Address of Welcome, by Dr. George Samler Davis, President of Hunter College; Response, by Professor David Moore Robinson, The Johns Hopkins University, President of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States: Papers, The Ruler Cult on Greek and Roman Coins, Mrs. Agnes Baldwin Brett, American Numismatic Society; Modern Greek an Aid to the Teacher of Ancient Greek, Professor Carroll N. Brown, College of the City of New York; Hendiadys: Is There Such a Thing?, Miss E. Adelaide Hahn, Hunter College; Greek Principles of Art and the Practice of Modern Artists, Professor Francis P. Donnelly, S. J., Boston College; Indirect Discourse and the Subjunctive of Attraction, Mr. Bernard M. Allen, The Roxbury School, Cheshire, Connecticut; Reading at Sight, by Mr. John Edmund Barss, The Loomis Institute, Windsor, Connecticut; Prometheus and the Gods: A Study of Aeschylus's Prometheus Bound, Professor William Kelley Prentice, Princeton University; Lydian Links Between Hittites and Etruscans, Dr. T. Leslie Shear, Columbia University; New Light on Some Problems of Ancient History, Professor Ida Carleton Thallon, Vassar College; Some Aspects of Intelligence, Professor Nelson Glenn McCrea, Columbia University; Where Did Aeneas Land When He Visited Cumae?, Miss Susan Fowler, The Brearley School, New York City; Vergil's Seamanship, Miss Mary Bradford Peaks, of the New York Bar (formerly of Vassar College); The Tragedy of Latinus, Professor Catharine Saunders, Vassar College; Exhibition of "Aeneid VI in the Movies" (under the auspices of the Classical Department, Hunter College).—Of these papers, two, those by Mrs. Brett and Dr. Shear, were illustrated by lantern-slides.

Professor Donnelly's paper was delivered at the Annual Dinner, on Friday evening. At the Dinner also greetings were brought from The Classical Association of New England, by its delegate, Mr. John Edmund Barss, and from The New York Classical Club, by Professor N. G. McCrea, Chairman of the Club's Committee on Relations with Other Classical Associations.

The report of the Secretary-Treasurer, in summary, was as follows:

The balance on hand in the Treasury of the Association, current cash account, April 22, 1920, was \$92.96. The receipts during the year were as follows: dues, \$1,694, interest, on funds in Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, \$13.60, on Liberty Loan Bonds, \$7.22, a total of \$20.82, from sale of the pamphlet, The Practical Value of Latin, \$38.84, from the sale of the pamphlet, The Teaching of English and the Study of the Classics, \$21.10, from the Emergency Fund, \$425, on account of Annual Dinner and Annual Luncheon, \$67.50, for miscellaneous items, \$6.15. The total receipts for the year

were thus \$2,273.41, and the total amount in the fund was \$2,366.37. The expenditures were as follows: for Annual Meeting, 1920, balance, \$2.50, for Annual Meeting, 1921, on account, \$48.03, to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volume 13, \$18, Volume 14, \$633, Volume 15, \$187, Volume 16, \$9 (a total of \$847), interest, transferred to Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, \$13.60, clerical assistance, \$334, postage, \$81.64, travelling expenses, \$118.42 (of this amount \$81.30 was for expenses of the Delegate to the meeting of The American Classical League, at Cincinnati), toward expense of circulars used in campaign for new members and subscribers, in October, 1920, \$38, transferred to the accounts of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, \$625, refund of 1922-1923 dues, \$2. The total expenditures were thus \$2,110.19. The balance on hand, April 11, 1921, was \$256.18.

In addition to this cash balance, subject to check, the Association has Liberty Loan Bonds, which cost \$300, and funds in the Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, amounting to \$413.33. The total assets of the Association are thus \$969.51 (if the Liberty Loan Bonds are carried at their cost, \$300).

On April 22, 1920, the balance to the credit of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, current cash account, was \$198.87. The receipts during the year were as follows: advertising, Volume 13, balance \$109.25, Volume 14 (on account), \$448, a total of \$557.25, exchange and postage, \$5.75, extra numbers and back volumes, \$182.83, interest, Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, \$27.20, interest, on Liberty Loan Bonds, \$10.70, a total of \$37.90, from members of the C. A. A. S., for Volumes 13, 14, 15, and 16, \$848, from subscribers, Volumes 13, 14, and 15, \$1,558, from W. F. Humphrey, special contribution, \$28, from C. A. A. S., toward expense of circulars used in campaign for new members and subscribers, in October, 1920, \$38, special contribution from C. A. A. S., \$625, miscellaneous, \$25. The total receipts during the year were thus \$3,880.98. The total in the funds was \$4,079.85. The total expenses were \$3,245.12. Of this amount the sum of \$343.35 was paid for printing the concluding numbers of Volume 13, and the sum of \$1,651.64 was paid on account of the printing of Volume 14. Other items of expense were as follows: clerical assistance, \$673.50, interest, transferred to Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, \$27.20, printing, 50,000 mailing envelopes, \$155, circulars used in campaign for new members, \$112.75, a total of \$267.75, stencils (including a complete new set, in August, 1920), \$40.78, miscellaneous supplies, \$68.47, office furniture, \$7.50, expressage and freight, \$9, miscellaneous, \$1.55, postage, \$154.38. The balance, subject to check, April 11, 1921, was \$834.73.

Estimates of additional income for Volume 14, mostly from advertising, amount to approximately \$160. The estimate of expenditures, for the balance of the volume, mostly for the printing of the concluding numbers, gives approximately \$675.

As a result, it appeared that there would be in the funds of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY at the close of the volume, money sufficient to equal the subscriptions paid in advance, for Volume 15, plus the amounts transferred from The Classical Association of the Atlantic States to the account of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, for members who had paid dues for 1921-1923, which carried with them Volumes 15-16 of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

To the credit of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY must be set also the sum of \$500, invested in Liberty Loan Bonds (cost price), and the sum of \$637.81 in the Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank. The total assets of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY were thus \$1,972.54.

By April 11, 1921, 217 members of the Association had made contributions, varying in amounts from \$1 to \$50, to the Emergency and Guaranty Fund. The total thus received was \$512.13. Over against this were charges of \$16.80 (for printing and postage in issuing the first circulars concerning the fund), and for transfer to the funds of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, \$425, a total of \$441.80. The balance in the Emergency Fund, April 11, 1921, was thus \$70.33.

In the University of Chicago Press account, on account of Classical Philology and The Classical Journal, the balance on hand, April 22, 1920, was \$8.48; the amount received during the year, for subscriptions to Classical Philology and The Classical Journal, Volumes 16-18, was \$532.36. Miscellaneous items of receipts totalled \$2.09. The total in the fund was thus \$542.93. During the year there was transmitted to the University of Chicago Press the sum of \$272.50, for 218 subscriptions to The Classical Journal, Volume 16, and \$189.57, for 71 subscriptions to Classical Philology, Volume 16; total \$462.07. The miscellaneous expenditures were \$2.09. The total expenditures were \$464.16. The balance on hand, April 11, 1921, for subscriptions to The Classical Journal and Classical Philology, Vol. 17, etc., was \$78.77.

From 1914-1921, subscriptions made by members of the Association to The Classical Journal were as follows: 132, 147, 143, 162, 161, 126, 155, 218. For the same years, the subscriptions to Classical Philology were 64, 62, 63, 67, 67, 57, 64, 71.

During the year the sum of \$33.25 was paid to the American Classical League, for 133 membership fees in the League, paid by members of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

The number of members of the Association reported on April 22, 1920, was 637. Since that time, 18 more members have paid dues for that year. The final total of members for 1919-1920 was thus 655. The number of members for 1920-1921, April 11, 1921, was 724, an increase of 69 members, or 10+%. The number of subscribers to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volume 13, reported on April 22, 1920, was 545. After that time, 28 subscriptions for Volume 13 were received, making the total for that Volume 573. On April 11, 1921, the subscribers to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volume 14, numbered 722, a gain of 149 subscribers, or 26%. The final total of members and subscribers combined for Volume 13 was 1228. The corresponding total for 1920-1921, on April 11, 1921, was 1446, a gain of 218, or 18-%. For the years 1914-1921 the membership figures were as follows: 683, 704, 741, 760, 681, 613, 655, 724. For the same years, the subscription figures were 630, 715, 815, 876, 704, 565, 573, 722. For the same years, the totals of members and subscribers were as follows: 1313, 1419, 1556, 1636, 1385, 1178, 1228, 1446.

The total cost of the pamphlet, The Practical Value of Latin (printing of 15,000 copies, \$275.41, and postage to April 11, 1921, \$14.50) was \$289.91. The amount received from sales, to April 11, 1921, was \$367.55. There was, therefore, an apparent profit of \$77.64. Against this, however, must be set unknown postage costs, in mailing copies to subscribers, prior to 1917; since 1917, the postage costs have been \$14.50. The cost of printing 5,000 copies of Professor Cooper's paper, The Teaching of English and the Study of the Classics, was \$30.77. The sum received from sales of the pamphlet, to April 11, 1921, was \$74.95. The apparent

profit was thus \$44.18. Over against this lie postage costs (at no time kept separately).

By way of summing up, the Secretary-Treasurer stated that the gross assets of the Association were, on April 11, 1921, as follows: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, \$969.51; THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, \$1,972.54; University of Chicago Press account, \$78.77; Emergency and Guaranty Fund, \$70.33; total, \$3,091.15.

The known liabilities of the Association, April 11, 1921, were as follows: subscriptions to Annual Dinner and Annual Luncheon, given at the Hotel Netherland, \$67.50; miscellaneous expenses, on account of Annual Meeting, balance, approximately \$25; estimated cost of remaining issues of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volume 14, and kindred charges, \$675, University of Chicago Press account, \$78.77. The total liabilities were thus \$846.77, and the net assets, \$2,244.88.

The Dinner and the Luncheon at the Hotel Netherland proved extraordinarily successful; at the former 50, at the latter 67 were present. The quiet, restful atmosphere of the hotel, the excellence of the food, quantitatively and qualitatively both, and of the service, and the opportunities for social converse made these two functions memorable. The Local Committee, with Professor Helen H. Tanzer, of Hunter College, as Chairman, did its work admirably. The sociability Committee of The New York Classical Club, with Miss Ruth Messenger as Chairman, rendered most able assistance. Special praise is due to the students of Hunter College, who aided in all sorts of ways, at the registration desk, as messengers, distributing texts, mimeographed sheets, etc., at the sessions. To all these, to those who contributed to the programme, either by formal papers or by participating in the discussions, to the Classical Department of Hunter College, to the Delegates from other Classical Organizations, and to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, warm thanks were given in resolutions presented by the Committee on Resolutions, whose Chairman was Professor C. W. E. Miller, of The Johns Hopkins University.

The attendance at the sessions ranged from 75 to 250, or even more. The latter figure was reached on Saturday afternoon. Probably the high attendance at that time was due in large part to interest in the exhibition of "Aeneid VI in the 'Movies'," which had been announced as to be given under the auspices of the Classical Department, Hunter College. But the frightful weather—the violent showers—kept many away. Unfortunately, since the film, in spite of repeated promises, had not even been started on its way from Atlanta by Friday noon, the exhibition could not be given.

From expressions volunteered to the Secretary, and, what is more important by far, made to others, and later reported, it appears that the programme was generally regarded as one of high interest and profit. Several papers called forth a good deal of discussion.

One action of the Executive Committee may be recorded here. The Committee expressed its deep satisfaction at the account, to be found in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.190-191, of the Classical Investigation now in progress under the direction of the American Classical League, and the Secretary-Treasurer was directed to convey to the League a statement to that effect, and the good wishes of the Association for the complete success of the investigation.

The following officers were elected: President, Professor Helen H. Tanzer, Hunter College; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Charles Knapp; Vice-Presidents, Professor Cleveland K. Chase, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York, Professor Willis P. Woodman, Hobart College, Geneva, New York, Mr. Charles Huntington Smith, Morristown School, Morristown, New Jersey, Dr. A. W. Howes, Central High School, Philadelphia, Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Miss Cora A. Pickett, High School, Wilmington, Delaware, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Miss Mildred Dean, Central High School, Washington, D. C. These officers, together with the retiring President, Professor D. M. Robinson, constitute the Executive Committee for the year. Professor Knapp holds over as Representative of the Association on the Council of the American Classical League.

C. K.

REVIEWS

The Genitive of Value in Latin and Other Constructions with Verbs of Rating. By Gordon J. Laing. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press (1920). Pp. viii + 48.

This monograph deals with our old friends *tantum*, *quantum*, *plurimum*, and *minoris et id genus omne*. The investigation is limited, as the title indicates, to verbs of 'rating', but this term has been construed elastically, for in the list of over twenty verbs there are some (notably *esse*) which are not strictly verbs of 'rating'. Verbs of 'buying' and 'selling', *refert*, and *interest* have not been included.

The types of expressions which have been examined are (for the genitive) A. The Attributive Genitive of Valuation with Substantives: (1) with an adjective accompanying the genitive, e. g. *magni preti servus*; (2) without an adjective, e. g. *homo nihili*; B. Genitive in the Predicate: (1) indefinite valuation, e. g. *te magni facio*; (2) expressions of worthlessness, e. g. *nihili sum*; (3) definite valuation (rare), e. g. *an emat denario quod sit mille denarium* (Cicero).

The purpose of the investigation is, to quote the Preface,

(1) to determine the origin of the genitive of value and (2) to ascertain the limits of the different combinations: what genitives and ablatives are used in expressions of valuation and with what verbs they are combined; and to what extent genitives, ablatives, and verbs vary in different authors and different spheres.

The work involves therefore contributions to lexicography and 'stylistic' as well as to historical syntax. The material is not complete, but nobody would demand this of such an investigation. The collections represent the language fairly well from the beginning of the literature to the end of the Augustan Age. For the first and the second centuries of the Empire they are less full. For later Latin only parts of about a dozen writers, from Tertullian to Gregory of Tours, have been excerpted. Thus Professor Laing has merely aimed to examine enough material to give validity to his results. The gaps in the material probably do not affect the surmises concerning the origin of the genitive of value, since the expressions investigated are already completely developed in the early literature, but the later history and the by-products of the work would be greatly supplemented and somewhat modified by the addition of more material.

The work of other scholars referred to here and there throughout the monograph consists chiefly of Grammars and Handbooks. A few special articles are mentioned, but not one of the numerous dissertations on the genitive or the ablative is cited. Some of these would have been useful at least for them collections. Perhaps the author includes them under his reference (in the Preface) "to other sources", or perhaps it was less laborious to use indices and special lexica.

The material is arranged under functional categories with subdivisions established on the basis of form. This arrangement separates phenomena which from one point of view belong together, e. g. *nihili* (attributive), *nihili* with verbs, and *pro nihilo*; but no classification can satisfy all requirements and in the present case the total amount of material is so moderate that with the aid of the numerous cross-references, the Index, and the list of verbs it is easy to obtain quickly a view of any given formal group.

Professor Laing begins his first chapter, The Genitive of Value (1-30), the most important part of the work, with a discussion and critique of theory; he closes it with a summary statement of his own view (1-8). Then follows the material on which his conclusions are based. The various theories which have been held with regard to the origin of the genitive of valuation, as Professor Laing terms the construction, are all examined in the light of the material and are all found unsatisfactory. The theory of a locative origin for this genitive is considered correct only in that it recognizes the original "adverbial character of the construction". The theory of partitive origin is adequate only as an explanation of the type *pensi ducere*. But the author devotes most of his critique to the theory that the genitive of value is derived from the genitive of quality. This is the view which has been generally held, but Professor Laing finds it unsatisfactory for four reasons. (1) No development of *magni preti* (by the dropping of *preti*) into *magni* (*tantum*, *plurimum*, etc.) can be traced in extant Latin, for both types appear in the earliest Latin, and, furthermore, *magni preti esse* (*esse* is the only verb used with this type by Plautus), instead of decreasing,

tends to increase as time goes on, other nouns (*ponderis*, etc.) and other verbs entering into the construction. (2) This theory does not, in his opinion, explain the phrases *boni consulere*, *acqui bonique facere*, and *pensi ducere*, of which the first two are very old and the last is partitive in origin. (3) It does not explain *nihili* (*floci*, *nauci*, etc.) with verbs of rating, for here we have nouns without an adjective, although the adjective is "an element of the utmost constancy" with the genitive of quality. (4) No genitive of quality has been proved for Indo-European; e. g. in Homer the nearest approach to it is the genitive of material. Hence, says Professor Laing, we may conclude that the genitive of value arose in Latin without the influence of the genitive of quality, as it certainly did in Greek.

The most recent view (Wackernagel's, accepted by Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2.93 ff.) is that the forms *multi*, *magni*, *parvi*, etc., were not originally genitives at all, but were forms parallel to the Sanskrit forms in *-i* which combine with the roots 'make', 'become', and 'be' to form phrases which mean 'to make or become something', 'to make or become a participant of something', 'to bring or come within the field of something'. In Latin, when these *-i*-forms had become identified with genitives, other real genitives (*pluris*, *minoris*, etc.) followed suit, and other verbs (*pendere*, *aestimare*, etc.) were added. Professor Laing thinks (7) that this theory is correct "in regarding the genitive of value as originally adverbial" and "in its implicit recognition of certain points of contact between the genitive of value and the partitive genitive", but he cannot believe that "such simple concepts" as *pluris esse* and *minoris esse* are late analogical expressions, not to mention the free combination in Latin of other genitive forms (*-ae*, *-arum*) with verbs of rating.

Professor Laing's own view is that the function of valuation "belonged to the genitive as a whole"; that (7) it is " . . . One of Several Instances of the Free Use of the Genitive with Verbs Expressing Various Phases of Connection or Relation". He objects (8) to attempts to derive all functions of the genitive from one or two original forces; rather "the original function of the genitive was of wide range", the possessive being "one phase, the partitive, another, the genitive of valuation another", and he believes that there were still others. . . . they are a series of conterminous groups, for the most part distinct but at some points merging into one another by subtle indistinguishable stages. . . . Thus "the most characteristic type of the genitive of value" consisted of *magni*, *boni*, *nihili*, etc., combined with *facere*, *pendere*, etc., but the field was enlarged by contributions from the partitive genitive (compare *acqui*, *boni*, *pensi*) and also —after the construction had become established— from the genitive of quality, for "any genitive of quality in which the noun was a word meaning or connoting value (e. g., *res magni preti*) was substantially a genitive of value".

One may approve much of this criticism and yet believe that the genitive of value is a variety of the

genitive of quality— "eine Abart des Genetivus qualitatis", as Wölfflin (quoted by Laing, page 2) says. The positive arguments against this view, which I have summarized, prove that it must be modified, not rejected. Professor Laing is right in denying that the type *magni*, *pluris*, etc., arose from *magni preti*, *pluris preti*, etc., by omission of *preti*. The strong argument here is the existence of both these types fully developed in the earliest Latin and the Greek parallels *μετρου*, *μελειος*. But it may be remarked in passing that the priority of *magni preti* in preliterary times is not disproved, as Professor Laing seems to think, by its persistence in literary times. The truth is merely that both constructions were vital enough to persist, neither being able to drive the other from the field, but this throws no light on the question which was the original construction.

The argument based on *boni consulere*, etc., is inconsistent with Professor Laing's own (correct) attitude that the genitive of value has points of contact with other functions of the case. He believes that these phrases are partitive in origin, although in general the genitive of value is not derived from the partitive function. The champion of the view that in general the genitive of value is a variety of the genitive of quality has the same right to except these phrases. Moreover, *boni consulere* does not seem to be partitive in origin (see below).

The absence of an adjective with *nihili*, *floci*, etc., does indeed "separate them from the class of the genitive of quality" (5), as we know it in the literature, but in discussing the origin of these constructions we are getting back into preliterary times. Moreover, these old formulae are themselves distinctly adjectival and so do not need an adjective.

The argument drawn from comparative philology is necessarily inconclusive. Even if we believe that the genitive of quality did not exist in Indo-European, it certainly existed —how early we do not know— in preliterary Latin, and the argument drawn by analogy from the facts of Greek does not establish more than the possibility of a parallel development in Latin.

Furthermore, there are positive arguments in favor of the priority and the domination of the genitive of quality. Professor Laing admits a close connection and a reciprocal influence between the two constructions, although in his opinion they arose separately. But can they ever have been separate in any real sense? The genitive of value is to the genitive of quality as sub-species to species. 'Quality' ('description') is the more general, the more inclusive, concept. It is easy to conceive of the descriptive, qualifying force of the case as passing into a valutive function, but very difficult to conceive this valutive function as essentially independent and equally early. This, however, is mere *a priori* argument. The real bond between the constructions as shown by the actual material is that very often both have in common an adjectival force. Professor Laing approaches the material by way of the

verbs with which the genitives occur and regards the genitives as adverbial. Even more important are the substantives (nouns, pronouns, etc.) which the genitives often qualify. This adjectival relation is obvious when the genitive is attributive. So, e. g. *homo nihili* has already become in early Latin so completely adjectival that *nihili* may be modified by an adverb: compare Plautus, Merc. 125 *nimis nihili tibicen siem*.

Let us illustrate the same relation among the predicative cases. The verb 'rates' something as valuable or worthless in comparison with some standard expressed or implied, so that the genitive, which expresses the verdict, is often equivalent to a predicate adjective or a predicate appositive (with *esse* a predicate nominative). Many of the verbs in Professor Laing's list are construed not only with the genitive of value, but also with the genitive of quality and with other expressions, as he himself points out. Excluding *esse*¹, most of these verbs mean broadly 'think', 'deem', 'consider'; compare *aestimare*, *ducere*, *existimare*, *putare*. When the verdict is one of valuation, involving always words denoting degree, quantity, number, etc., the verb may be called a verb of 'rating'. Here, then, 'valuation' becomes one phase of a broader category which we term 'descriptive', 'qualitative', 'characteristic', etc., or (in terms of grammatical relation), 'adjectival'. With *aestimo*, for example, the verdict of valuation takes the following forms²: (a) the genitive (1) of a substantive adjective, e. g. *magni aestimo unius aestatis fructum* (Cicero), (2) of a substantive (to express worthlessness), e. g. *me esse mortuum nihili aestimo* (Cicero), (3) of an adjective and a substantive, e. g. *rumores . . . unius aestimemus assis* (Catullus); (b) the ablative of (1) a substantive adjective, e. g. *magno te aestimaturum si scire . . . posses* (Livy); (2) a substantive, e. g. *quidquid homines vita aestimant* (Curtius); (3) a substantive (to express worthlessness), e. g. *honores eorum nihilo aestimant* (Seneca); (4) an adjective and a substantive, e. g. *magno ubique pretio virtus aestimatur* (Valerius Maximus); (c) a substantive in predicate apposition, e. g. *tam quam lutum aestimabitur argentum* (Augustine); (d) an adverb, e. g. *propter amorem carius sunt aestimata* (Plancus apud Ciceronem, Ad Fam. 10.4.2). See the Thesaurus for a long list of adverbs.

If, however, *aestimo* means 'consider', 'deem'—the broader meaning —, the verdict concerning the object or, if the verb is passive, the subject, takes the following forms: (A) the genitive of an adjective and substantive, e. g. *alicuius nominis aestimabar* (Hieronymus): compare above, a, 3; (B) a predicate adjective, e. g. *quod iuvat, quod carum aestimant, id semper faciunt* (Sallust): compare above, a, 1 and 2; (C) a predicate

appositive noun or adjective, e. g. *alienam famam . . . suum dedecus aestimant* (Pseudo-Sallust); compare above, c; (D) a prepositional phrase with the ablative, e. g. *Aegyptios . . . pro sociis ipsos aestimanturos* (Curtius: this construction does not happen to occur with *aestimo* to express value, but it occurs with several other verbs of 'rating', e. g. *puto, duco, habeo*); (E) an adverb, e. g. *divitiae non melius . . . aestimantur* (Apuleius): compare above, d; (F) accusative and infinitive—very common.

Thus the relation of both the genitive of value and the genitive of quality to the object of the verb (the subject of *esse* or a passive form) is predominantly adjectival, and the constructions run closely parallel courses whether the verb has the more general meaning 'deem' or the more special meaning 'rate'. The genitive displays a decided affinity for the substantive. Furthermore, valuation is often expressed by real adjectives; compare *carus, pretiosus, vilis*, etc., and these adjectives, because of their meanings, naturally do not have to be placed in the genitive case. Moreover, Quintilian evidently felt the genitive in the old phrase: *boni consulere* to be adjectival, for he says (1.6.32), *rogat boni consulas, id est bonum iudices*. In general, the genitive answers the question, Of what sort, quality, value, etc.? Yet at times the point of view is adverbial. Hence with many of the verbs an adverb may be used to express 'value', 'quality', etc., e. g. *valde care aestimas tot annos* (Cicero).

Professor Laing has been struck by the fact that other constructions besides the genitive are used to express value, and he has included a full collection of ablatives together with rather meager lists of prepositional phrases (*pro, in, cum*) and adverbs. The collection of ablatives supports the old rule that in expressions of valuation the genitive is indefinite, the ablative definite, but there are enough exceptions to show that the difference in meaning between the two cases was very slight. He believes that the ablative with verbs of 'rating' (which regularly have a genitive) is due to the influence of the ablative of price (originally means). As in the case of the genitive, the words occurring with the ablative often denote degree, quantity, number, etc.—indeed they are often the same words; e. g. *we* have both *magni* and *magno* (*aestimare*, etc.), *parvi* and *parvo*, *nihili* and *nihilo*, *maioris* and *maiore*, etc. The only adjectives used alone with the ablative which do not occur in Professor Laing's lists with the genitive are *caro, vili* (*vilissimo*). Doubtless this identity of the words involved had much to do with the overlapping of the constructions.

Now, if we ask what relation these ablatives bear to the substantive which is 'rated', we find that they are not, like the genitives, predominantly adjectival. There are no attributive ablatives—no *homo nihilo* to correspond with *homo nihili*. The cases are all predicative, and the ablative shows an affinity for the verb. If the genitive usually answers the question, Of what sort, value, etc.?, the ablative usually answers the question,

¹*Esse* was undoubtedly, as Professor Laing says, one of the earliest verbs used in this construction, and, so far as the genitive is concerned, the illustrations given below would be more varied and even clearer, if one were to include the constructions with *esse*. I have chosen *aestimare*, however, because it is a typical verb of 'rating'.

²See Professor Laing's lists and the Thesaurus, s. v. *aestimo*.

How do I rate him, etc.? And yet the ablative also approaches closely at times to an adjective. A thing or a person could be rated as worth a sesterce; compare *divitiae, gratia, potentia sestertio nummo aestimanda sunt* (Seneca). The same idea could be expressed by an adjective; compare *sestertiarius homo* (Petronius). With this in turn compare the 'three-fig aedile', *aedilem trium cauniarum* (Petronius). The development was the same as that with which we are familiar in such phrases as 'ten-cent cigar', 'no-account niggah'. This occasional affinity of the ablative for the substantive, especially when the words are identical and the idea is indefinite, is a striking indication of the overlapping of these constructions and is due in all probability to the influence of the genitive upon the ablative. Among the prepositional expressions also there are several which were felt as closely akin to an adjective, e.g. *res humanae tennes ac pro nihilo putantur* (Cicero—note *tennes ac*), or an appositive, e.g. the phrase *pro luto habere* or *esse* as compared with *tamquam lutum aestimabitur argentum*.

Professor Laing's monograph opens up a wide field. To clear up the whole subject it would be necessary to include in the investigation all the methods by which valuation and the wider concept of quality are expressed, especially the genitive of quality, the descriptive ablative, the adjectives *carus, pretiosus, vilis*, etc., adverbs, and appositives. But—*vita brevis!* We must be grateful to Professor Laing for what he has given us.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

The "Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano". A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America. By Rev. Edwin J. Auweiler, O. F. M. Washington, D. C. (1917). Pp. 64.

The contents of this dissertation are as follows: Preface (5-6); History of the Chronicle of Jordan of Giano (7); The Manuscripts (8-12); Indirect Sources of the Text (13-15); The Editions (16-19); The Life of Jordan (20-44); The Latin Text of the Present Edition (45-53); Apparatus Criticus (54-60); Bibliography (61-63); Vita (64).

Jordan's Chronicle, written in the latter half of the thirteenth century, is an account of the "coming of the first friars into Germany and <of> their lives and their deeds".

In his discussion of the life of Jordan Dr. Auweiler discusses the Latinity of Jordan. In so doing he treats one phase of Latinity which will interest classical students. Henry Boehmer, in his edition of the *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, which was published in *Collection d'Études et de Documents sur l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 6 (Paris, 1908), suggested that Jordan's Latin is heavy and shows signs of being deeply affected by the vernacular Italian just then coming into its status as a modern language. He had even ventured to say that a number of Jordan's expressions are 'Italian vulgarisms', and argued from this that

Jordan was an Italian without much culture. In contradiction to this Dr. Auweiler has pointed out how many of the examples cited by Boehmer to prove his contention are really adoptions or adaptations from the Latin of the Scriptures, though most of them have behind them the authority also of recognized good Latin writers. The partitive expressions with *de*, for instance, used instead of the genitive, which came into usage in the modern languages, is of quite respectable antiquity and can be found frequently among Latin writers of the classical as well as of the post-classical time. Dr. Auweiler has given a number of examples. The use of *subito* in the sense of 'all at once' or 'quickly' is found in Cicero, as well as in the Latin Vulgate. The use of the preposition *de*, in the sense of *secundum*, is not a modern Italianism, but is found in Suetonius, Tibullus, and Caesar. The expression *in sero* need not be a vulgarism or a modernism, for *serum*, in almost precisely that sense, is used by Livy and Suetonius. *Culpo* in the sense of 'blaming', impugned by Boehmer as an Italian vulgarism, will be found used "in this sense by such ancient Italians as Plautus, Ovid, Horace, Suetonius, Quintilian and others".

In a word, Dr. Auweiler has brought out the fact that the style of medieval writers, so largely influenced by the Scriptures, is not nearly so distant from ancient Latin as is usually thought when students limit the comparison to the Latin classical writers. Jordan very frequently uses the ablative absolute and other participial constructions, but this, too, is probably due to the influence of the Scriptures, for, as Miss Stawell pointed out in an article on Luke the Evangelist, who, she suggests, was a Latin and probably a relative of Vergil, Luke uses the genitive absolute in his Greek gospel in a way that is characteristic of Latin rather than of Greek, but in a way that deeply influenced the style of the Latin scriptures.

NEW YORK CITY.

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D.

THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

The Classical Forum

A meeting of The Classical Forum of The New York Classical Club was held in Students' Hall, Barnard College, Saturday, March 12, at 10:30 A. M. The general topic of discussion was The Measurement of Results in Latin Instruction. Two papers were presented—the first, by Dr. Barclay W. Bradley, of the College of the City of New York, who spoke of Recent Experiments in Standard Tests, the second by Mr. Robert Raiman, of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, who reported the results of his experience with the Otis Intelligence Tests.

Dr. Bradley began by reminding his audience of the need for objective standards of judgment of pupils' work, as evidenced by the hopeless divergence in subjective judgments of the same work by teachers. The beginning in Latin had been made under the direction of Professor Hanus, who published two tests, one of vocabulary, and the other of translation of detached sentences. These tests did not fully meet the requirements, in that the material used was somewhat arbitrarily selected, and the scale-values of the various

questions was not empirically determined. A valuable principle was, however, introduced—that translations should be judged by the accuracy of rendering the separate "thought units" of the original, rather than by mere verbal fidelity.

Professor Daniel Starch, at first alone, and later in collaboration with Mr. Watters, published tests in vocabulary and sentence-translation, in which the principle of "random selection" was carried to extremes. The lecturer felt that the principle could not be wholly dismissed, but was capable of wiser application.

Professor V. A. C. Henmon, of Wisconsin, had made the first serious attempt to evaluate his material empirically. His vocabulary tests marked a distinct advance. His tests for translation of detached sentences offered an attempt to grade difficulty, and were useful, even though open to some criticism.

The most elaborate research in the Latin field was that of Mr. H. A. Brown, President of Oshkosh Normal School, Wisconsin. He had drawn up Tests in Vocabulary, Translation of Detached Sentences, Translation of Connected Discourse, and Formal Grammar, in all of which he had carefully worked out scale-values by experiment with nearly 2,000 pupils. In his Test in Translation of Connected Discourse he had applied with skill the principle of "Thought Units" which Professor Hanus had suggested. His conclusions were impaired by the meager time allowance given to the test. The lecturer urged wider experiment with this material under more favorable conditions.

Tests in Latin Sources of English Words, and in Inflectional Forms, had been prepared but were not yet available.

In the discussion which followed, Dr. Bradley emphasized the distinction between "scales" and "standard tests", such as those under discussion. No attempt had been made to construct Latin scales.

The Secretary read an invitation from the New York Society for Experimental Research in Education to the members of The New York Classical Club to join in the work of the Classical Section of the Society, which had the subject of measurement of *its* under especial consideration.

Mr. Raiman presented some interesting statistics in regard to the Otis tests given to the entering classes at Boys' High School. He did not feel that the tests by themselves were an accurate index of the language abilities of his pupils. The discussion developed some difference of experience. It seemed to be the general opinion that the Otis Tests did offer valuable evidence as to the general abilities of pupils, but needed to be corrected in many individual cases.

ARTHUR A. BRYANT, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

TRANSLATIONS OF ARISTOTLE

In 1920 the Oxford University Press brought out, in one volume, a translation of two works of Aristotle—of the *Oeconomica* of Aristotle, by E. S. Forster, Lecturer in Greek in the University of Sheffield, and of the *Atheniensium Respublica*, by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon.

Mr. Forster, in his brief Preface of two pages, declares that neither of the two books of the *Oeconomica* is the work of Aristotle himself. The first book contains elements derived from Aristotle himself, but it owes much to the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon. "It appears to be the work of a Peripatetic writer who was a pupil either of Aristotle himself or of a disciple of that philosopher". This man wrote before the Peripatetic School had "become eclectic and coloured by Stoic influence".

Book 2 is in certain ways, says Mr. Forster, quite un-Aristotelian. It was written, some time after

Aristotle's day, by a writer who lived outside Greece proper.

Mr. Forster's translation reads very smoothly.

Sir Frederic Kenyon's translation is a careful revision of the translation he published in 1891 of the *Atheniensium Respublica*, shortly after the first appearance of the Greek text. The last six chapters (63-69) are translated here for the first time. These have been reconstructed out of a large number of fragments and were first published as a printed text in the edition of this work which Sir Frederic Kenyon prepared for the Berlin Academy in 1903. In the translation, he says, he has tried "to follow the matter-of-fact, unadorned style of the original". There is an Index to each translation. In accordance with the absurd system—or rather lack of system—which the Oxford University Press follows in certain of its books, this work is unpaginated.

It remains to say that this volume is part of the Oxford Translation of Aristotle, which is to consist of eleven volumes, uniform in contents with the volumes of Bekker's edition of Aristotle. The following volumes have appeared:

III, (Parts) *De Longitudine Vitae*, *De Juventute et Senectute*, *De Vita et Morte*, *De Respiratione*, *De Mundo*, by E. S. Forster, *De Spiritu*, by J. F. Dobson; IV, *Historia Animalium*, by D'Arcy W. Thompson (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5.65-66); V, *De Partibus Animalium*, by W. Ogle, *De Motu and De Incessu*, by A. S. L. Farquharson, *De Generatione Animalium*, by A. Platt; VI, *De Lineis Insecabilibus*, by H. H. Joachim, *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, by L. D. Dowdall, *De Coloribus*, *De Audibilibus*, *De Xenophane Zenone et Gorgia*, *Physiognomonica*, by T. Loveday and E. S. Forster, *De Plantis*, *Mechanica*, *Ventorum Situs et Nomina*, by E. S. Forster; VIII, *Metaphysica*, by W. D. Ross; IX, (Part), *Ethica Eudemia De Virtutibus et Vitiis*, by J. Solomon.

C. K.

A strike of compositors and pressmen, still in force (June 30), has held up this and the next issue of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*. The foregoing sentence will explain also shortcomings in these two issues.